

FRANK BROCCOLINA
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1295 Fax: (410) 974-2066
frank.broccolina@mdcourts.gov

FAYE D. GASKIN
DEPUTY STATE COURT
ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1257 Fax: (410) 974-2066
faye.gaskin@mdcourts.gov

SHARON SAMPSON BALL Executive Director Human Resources (410) 260-1283 Fax: (410) 974-2849 sharon.ball@mdcourts.gov

GRAY BARTON
Executive Director
Office of Problem-Solving Courts
2011-D Commerce Park Drive
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 260-3617 Fax: (410) 841-9850
gray.barton@mdcourts.gov

PHILIP S. BRAXTON
Executive Director
Judicial Information Systems
2661 Riva Road, Suite 900
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 260-1000 Fax: (410) 974-7170
philip.braxton@mdcourts.gov

ALLEN C. CLARK, III
Executive Director
Budget & Finance
(410) 260-1579 Fax: (410) 260-1290
allen.clark@mdcourts.gov

DAVID R. DURFEE JR.
Executive Director
Legal Affairs
(410) 260-1405 Fax: (410) 974-2066
david.durfee@mdcourts.gov

RAYMOND MACK
Executive Director
Procurement & Contract
Administration
(410) 260-1410 Fax: (410) 260-1749
raymond.mack@mdcourts.gov

PAMELA CARDULLO ORTIZ
Executive Director
Family Administration
(410) 260-1580 Fax: (410) 974-5577
pamela.ortiz@mdcourts.gov

DIANE S. PAWLOWICZ
Executive Director
Court Research & Development
(410) 260-1725 Fax: (410) 974-2066
diane.pawlowicz@mdcourts.gov

ROXANNE P. McKAGAN Manager Administrative Services (410) 260-1407 Fax: (410) 974-2066 rocky.mckagan@mdcourts.gov

DEBORAH A. UNITUS Manager Program Services (410) 260-1291 Fax: (410) 974-5577 deborah.unitus@mdcourts.gov

## ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER 580 TAYLOR AVENUE ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Re: Request for Proposal K08-2058-25G *Public Policy Facilitation Services* 

## **AMENDMENT #1**

Dear Interested Party:

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) hereby makes the following changes/clarifications to the above referenced Request for Proposal.

The Following consists of questions raised by participants at the Pre-Proposal Conference on November 8, 2007 and the answers herein provided by the Maryland Judiciary.

**QUESTION:** The RfP implies that more specific task orders will be written for individual projects that will be the subject of the public policy facilitation referenced in this RfP. It implies, but is not explicit, that the facilitator and MACRO will negotiate regarding the level of effort needed to do the specific project when the project-specific task order is written. Is this correct? What happens if MACRO and the facilitator cannot agree on the level of effort needed – does the facilitator have the option to opt out "without prejudice"?

ANSWER: MACRO and the facilitator will negotiate the level of effort needed to do the specific project(s) as you indicate. If the facilitator and MACRO can't agree on what is needed to facilitate the case, the facilitator is not required to take that case.

**QUESTION:** Relatedly, the RfP appears to be worded such that bidders are promising that they will provide convening, information gathering and issue clarification, option generation, agreement writing, and review / sign off on the agreement in small and large groups – all within 70 hours (if MACRO doesn't exercise its option to increase or decrease the hours). Is this correct? If so, making such a commitment without knowing the nature of the particular project is a concern, as there are many public policy facilitation projects for which all of those steps could not reasonably be done in 70 hours or less.

**ANSWER:** Cases will need to be chosen in conjunction with MACRO and with the facilitator that have a reasonable expectation of being completed in about 70 hours. If both agree to go forward and then new information arrives that indicates a longer time is needed, MACRO and the facilitator would need to re-negotiate.

**QUESTION:** On the pricing page, does MACRO want bidders to include "other direct costs" in this bid? If so, are there assumptions you would like all bidders to use as a basis for estimating direct costs?

**ANSWER:** Vendor shall include all cost associated with performing this project with the exception of out of state travel expenses referenced on page7 of the RFP.

**QUESTION:** How you define "principal" professional (with regard to applicants needing to have been principal professional on 4-10 environmental / public policy cases)? Do you mean the lead on the case, or being a core member of the facilitation or mediation team? (We're wondering if someone could count a case for which they were a member of the team, but not the lead?)

ANSWER: You can determine what principal professional means to you. Obviously, a principal facilitator, whether the leader or a core member, would need to have been involved in decision making about the process as well as being part of carrying it out

**QUESTION:** On the bid, we assume the cost per project should be based on using only one facilitator?

**ANSWER:** Would also assume that the cost per project should be based on using only one facilitator.

**QUESTION:** On page 7, Reimbursement of Expenses implies that these expenses should not be included in the cost per project. But the Price Proposal Work Sheet affirmation state that the price should include transportation....so should the cost per project include travel, mileage, etc???

ANSWER: As stated on page 7 of the RFP, travel from out of state to Maryland will not be reimbursed.

**QUESTION:** We have two facilitators available at our firm - at different rates. Should we submit one proposal for the firm, indicating the two hourly rates and the two possible costs per project, depending on which facilitator is used? Or should we submit two proposals, one for each facilitator?

**ANSWER:** I suggest two proposals - it just seems simpler.

These are the only changes contemplated by Amendment # 1. All other specifications, terms and conditions of the Request for Proposals remain the same.

Sincerely,

Lisa Peters Procurement Specialist